JUL 2 8 2008

Programs and Services:

1. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your district's program cost?

Per the table provided to us, the increase would be \$3,906,461 or 19%.

- 2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your district?
 - a) Educational Programs

Increase Bilingual/ELL teachers and programs for 2 schools
Provide endorsement courses for TESOL/Bilingual
Provide stipends for TESOL endorsement
Enhance career-technical education
Provide intervention specialist for three schools
Increase music program at secondary schools
Increase resource teachers at elementary schools
Retain or increase educational assistants at elementary schools
Increased tutorial and after-school programs
Increased course offerings for summer school

b) Student Services

Increase counselors' services for 3 schools Hire truancy officer

3. Will your district use the additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected?

The additional funding would be used to reduce class size to 15 students for Kindergarten through sixth grade throughout the district. Twenty to twenty-two new teachers would need to be added to the elementary schools depending on the student population. Additional teachers would require re-opening a school which adds the cost of support staff.

4. What other changes might your district consider as a result of additional funding?

Raises for Health Assistants and Maintenance

- 5. How will your district ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?

 Programs and services will be tracked through STARS and Powerschool.
 - bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
 - health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
 - career-technical education;
 - visual and performing arts and music;
 - gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
 - special education; and
 - distance education.
- 6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Teachers	22			110	132
Principals	1			7	8
Counselors	2			3	2
Nurses	1			2	3
Physical Education Teachers				10	10
Art and Music Teachers		1		11	12
Social Workers				8	8
Librarians	1			6	7
Advanced Placement				2.3	2.3
Teachers					
Gifted Education				10	10
Intervention Specialists	1	1	1	4	7
Bilingual Education	2			25	27
Educational Assistants	5			37	42
Special Education Teachers	3			32	35
(excluding gifted)					
Ancillary and Support Staff				11	11
Maintenance and Operations	2			35	37
Staff (including custodians)					
Data Entry Clerks					
Other Central Office Staff				21	21
Other School-based Staff	3			33	36

Accountability:

The legislation introduced during the 2008 session to change the public school funding formula utilizes the Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) as the means of ensuring accountability with regard to districts providing a sufficient educational program for all students that includes not only the basic required academic programs, such as reading, writing, and math, but also programs such as bilingual-multicultural education, physical education, arts and music, and gifted programs. In short, PED is required to disapprove any budget for a district or charter school that cannot show in its EPSS that it is offering all required programs.

7. Do you believe that the EPSS is the appropriate mechanism to tie together budget approval and program delivery? If not, what means would you suggest be used as an alternative to ensure accountability?

The EPSS is currently used for districts/schools not making AYP. The EPSS has a specific and narrow focus for targets in reading and math. Gifted and AP classes are usually not addressed in the EPSS because those students are usually proficient. A different EPSS format for the program delivery for the district would be needed.

Staff Salaries:

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.
- The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.

8.	If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (Attachment 2), how would this factor impact funding for your district? The factor would have no impact since the result was 1.00. Please see attached matrix.									
Spe	cial Education:									
9.	Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as in need of special education, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? (Do not include gifted students.)									
	Number:									
10.	How will the proposed funding formula's use of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?									
	If additional funds are allocated, special education would utilize the funds in the following manner: • Focus staff training on the areas that have been found deficient subject									

- matter areas as measured by the SBA.
- o Jointly with other federally funded programs, focus on assisting teachers with specific training in working with ELL/IDEA identified students.
- o Be able to purchase additional programs that are scientifically researched as being effective with instruction for ELL/SpEd identified students.
- o Employee specialists in deficient areas to work as a team members with special ed. teachers targeting those specific weak areas.
- o Employee a school liaison to work closely with our parents to assist with increased parent involvement in their child's education.
- o Employ additional special education instructional assistant to lower student/adult ratio as well as increase personal attention time to those students needing extra assistance.

CIEC		T 1	cation	
1 -1110		H AD	IPOTIAN	
VIIIL	ш	1741	Cauron	

11.			in your district have been arollment does this number		•	nd what
	Number: _	213	Percentage:	6	%	
12.	students that require that of students Currentl higher level schools that would also	at have been identificated these students be sidentified as gifted by, we are making a cl students. With the thave little or no so make our gifted en	ed during the session do ied as gifted to be in need erved. How will your of the strong effort to providese funds we would passistance by personned ducation coordinator patchin all schools in our	ed of special district special of the bette or ovide fel special position	cial education, pecifically address to or services to or ull time staff illy trained in gfull time so the	it does ress the needs ur gifted and n those gifted. We
	enrichmen		ing for our teachers of pacting and addition fing.			
Rev	enue Source	es for Implementat	ion:			
13.	district supp		dditional dollars needed	d to reach	ı sufficiency w	ould your
Pote	ential Proble	ems:				
14.	the propose Ability to	ed funding formula? find 22 additional	our district anticipate wi teachers for class size in id reopen a school that	reductio	ns.	nentation of
15.		ems, if any, does yo not implemented?	our district anticipate wi	ll arise if	the proposed f	unding
16.	Please feel that you fee	free to identify any el the committee sho	other issues that have no	ot been a	ddressed in the	ese questions
xc:	Legislativ	e Education Study (Committee			

PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA: SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER SCHOOLS

	n: Roswell	Location: Albuquerque		Location: Kirtla	ınd	Location: Ro		Location: Demi		Location: Santa Fe	
May	12-14	June 9-11		August 6		September 8-10		October 8-10		November	
District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM
Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1	1
Artesia	3,548.5		88,271.5	Central Consolidated	6,614.5	Las Vegas City	2,085.5	Alamogordo	6,321.0	Albuquerque	88,271.5
Clovis	8,035.0	Los Lunas	8,561.0	Farmington	10,189.5	Raton	1,360.5	Gadsden	13,955.5	Santa Fe	12,266.0
Hobbs	7,809.5	Rio Rancho	15,577.0	Gallup-McKinley	12,159.0	Taos	2,795.0	Las Cruces	23,559.5		1
Lovington	3,084.0					West Las Vegas	1,703.5				1
Portales	2,773.0										1
Roswell	9,373.5										
Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2	
Capitan	536.5	Belen	4,749.5	Aztec	3,064.5	Cimarron	450.0	Carlsbad	5,905.5	Española	4,309.0
Cloudcroft	461.0	Bemalillo	3,176.0	Bloomfield	3,096.5	Clayton	539.5	Cobre	1,396.5	Los Alamos	3,444.0
Dexter	1,097.0	Estancia	1,005.0	Grants-Cibola	3,698.0	Mora	567.5	Deming	5,418.0	Pojoaque	2,019.5
Eunice	570.5	Moriarty	3,590.5	Zuni	1,505.0	Questa	434.5	Hatch Valley	1,428.0	Ruidoso	2,273.5
Hagerman	448.0	Socorro	1,722.5					Silver Consolidated	3,091.5	Tucumcari	1,045.0
Jal	405.0							Truth or Consequences	1,392.0		1
Loving	570.5										1
Texico	526.0										
Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3	
Carrizozo	215,5	Corona	84.5	Cuba	695.0	Des Moines	94.0	Animas	257.0	Chama	454.0
Dora	225.5	Jemez Valley	326.5	Dulce	691.0	Maxwell	102.0	Lordsburg	680.0	Jemez Mountain	343.0
Elida	120.5	Magdalena	428.5			Mosquero	38.0	Reserve	185.0	Logan	231.0
Floyd	243.5	Mountainair	339.0			Roy	79.0	Tularosa	959.0	Mesa Vista	437.0
Fort Sumner	304.5	Quemado	186.0			Springer	195.0			Pecos	714.0
Grady	121.5		*****			Wagon Mound	148.5			Peñasco	547.5
Hondo Valley		Group 4								San Jon	149.5
House	107.0		,				*			Santa Rosa	654.0
Lake Arthur	148.0	Creative Ed. Prep. Inst								Vaughn	103.5
Melrose	208.5	Deming Cesar Chave	•								i
Tatum	292.5	Digital Arts & Tech. Ac									i
		El Camino Real, Albud	• •								1
		Middle College High S	•								
		Mosaic Academy, Azi									1
		Nuestros Valores, Albu									
		Rio Gallinas School, W								ĺ	ł
I		Sidney Gutlerrez Middl									ļ
1		SW Secondary Learnin								1	1
		Taos Charter School, 1									1
		Turquoise Trail, Santa F									
		Walatowa, Jemez Pue	blo								j

NOTE: The district groupings are based on 2007-2008 40-day membership.

ISQ-A - Teachers, Including Librarians

								Level	ı							
Year's Within Level		0 –	1		2 –	3		4 –	5					4.0	Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE						FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	16.00	0.64	10.24	14.58	0.67	9.77	3.00	0.71	2.13						33.58	22.14
Master's	1.00	0.68	0.68	1.00	0.72	0.72	2.21	0.76	1.68						4.21	3.08
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.71	0.00		0.75	0.00	1.16	0.79	0.91				100		1.16	0.91
Total	17.00		10.92	15.58		10.49	6.37		4.73						38.95	26.13
Level II																
Year's Within Level		4 –	6		7	8		9 – 1	15		Over	15			Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE			FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	19.35	0.76	14.71	11.26	0.82	9.23	38.46	0.93	35.77	32.71	1.04	34.02			101.78	93.73
Master's	6.13	0.81	4.97	3.00	0.88	2.64	3.00	1.00	3.00	9.21	1.11	10.23			21.35	20.84
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.85	0.00		0.92	0.00		1.05	0.00		1.16	0.00			0.00	0.00
Total	25.49		19.68	14.26		11.87	41.46		38.77	41.93		44.25			123.13	114.56
								Level	111							
Year's Within Level		7 –	8		9 –	15		Over	15						Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE		Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE						FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's		0.90	0.00		1.02	0.00	1.00	1.17	1.17						1.00	1.17
Master's	2.00	0.96	1.92	20.28	1.09	22.11	19.71	1.25	24.64					1	41.99	48.67
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	1.00	1.01	1.01	1.00	1.14	1.14	13.34	1.31	17.48						15.34	19.63
Total	3.00		2.93	21.28		23.25	34.05		43.29		a partie				58.33	69.46
	•													Matrix Totals	220.41	210.16

ISQ-B - Other Instructional Staff

Years of Experience		0 –	2		3	5		6 –	8		9 –	15	Over 15			Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Adjusted FTE									
Bachelor's or Less	0.67	0.65	0.44		0.78	0.00		0.87	0.00	2.00	0.91	1.82	0.17	0.91	0.15	2.84	2.41
Bachelor's + 15		0.70	0.00		0.83	0.00		0.87	0.00		0.96	0.00		1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Master's/Bachelor's + 45		0.74	0.00		0.87	0.00		0.91	0.00		1.00	0.00	4.33	1.04	4.50	4.33	4.50
Master's + 15		0.78	0.00		0.91	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.13	0.00	3.31	1.17	3.87	4.31	4.87
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.87	0.00	0.29	1.00	0.29		1.13	0.00		1.22	0.00	2.63	1.30	3.42	2.92	3.70
Total	0.67		0.44	0.29		0.29	1.00		1.00	2.00		1.82	10.44		11.95	14.40	15.49
															Matrix Totals	14.40	15.49

GRAND TOTAL (ISQ-A + ISQ-B) 234.81 225.65 RAW INDEX OF STAFF QUALIFICATIONS 1.00